

**FILED**

**NOV 20 2007**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

**FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

DAVID DANIEL NELSON,

Defendant - Appellant.

No. 06-50204

D.C. No. CR-05-00101-CAS-01

MEMORANDUM<sup>\*</sup>

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Christina A. Snyder, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 22, 2007<sup>\*\*</sup>

Before: B. FLETCHER, WARDLAW, and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

David Daniel Nelson appeals from his 8-month sentence imposed upon revocation of supervised release. Pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), Nelson's counsel has filed a brief stating there are no grounds for relief, along with a motion to withdraw as counsel of record. We have provided the

---

<sup>\*</sup> This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

<sup>\*\*</sup> The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

appellant an opportunity to file a pro se supplemental brief. No pro se supplemental brief or answering brief has been filed.

Our independent review of the record pursuant to *Penson v. Ohio*, 488 U.S. 75, 80-81 (1988), discloses no grounds for relief on direct appeal.

Accordingly, counsel's motion to withdraw is **GRANTED**, and the district court's judgment is **AFFIRMED**.